



Memo

To: Proponents

- Katelyn Crowley, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
- Harry Froussios, Planner, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
- Saad Khalaf, Architect, HGA Ltd.

City of London Personnel

- Vanessa Santos, Site Development Planner
- Jerzy Smolarek, Urban Designer

From: Urban Design Peer Review Panel (UDPRP)

- Steven Cooper, Architect (absent)
- Jordan Kemp, Urban Designer
- John Nicholson, Architect
- Janine Oosterveld, Urban Designer
- Heather Price, Urban Designer (absent)
- McMichael Ruth, Architect

**RE: Site Plan Consultation: 112 St. James Street
Presentation & Review, December 19, 2018**

The Panel provides the following feedback on the submission to be addressed through site plan application.

- The Panel recognizes the importance of this property and the proposed site development as a terminating view from both St. James and Talbot Streets. It is important that the site design and built form address this view-shed as further discussed in comments below.
- At the meeting, the proponent indicated that they are planning on proceeding with an Official Plan and Zoning bylaw amendment to “square off” the property. The Panel is of the opinion that this is an important step in resolving site organization, particularly with respect to pedestrian and vehicular access to the street as well as to accommodate the recommended changes to the ground floor identified below.
- The Panel does not support the current organization of the ground floor and access / circulation through the site - with loading, garbage and garage doors and a dead-end driveway as the primary view into the site from the street. The front door should be the focal point at the view terminus, directly accessible and visible from the public street, and creating a connection of this property to the neighbourhood. The Panel also questions the functionality of the driveway relative to turn-

around and does not support its location in front of the building. The Panel recommends that the “east-west” driveway be eliminated and that “back of house” activities (access to the underground garage, loading, etc.) be located at the northern portion of the ground floor, at the end of “north-south” driveway, out of view from the public realm and minimizing potential conflict with pedestrians and vehicles.

- The southeast portion of the building is one of the most important elements of the building, yet it is one of the least developed with significant expanses of blank wall and servicing garages. The southeast portion of the building should be modified to create the primary pedestrian entrance to the building and should also include active uses (e.g., townhouses, indoor amenity spaces).
- The scale, massing, and expression of the building in this area should address the surrounding residential context through wrapping the podium around front facade. This could also include shifting the tower to the north to shifting massing back from the street to better address the neighbourhood character. This could include integrating two storey townhouses on the south side of the building, where they will better relate to the surrounding context.
- It is important that the relationship of site along its front with the trail be resolved. Some plans show an at-grade pedestrian connection, while others demonstrate a significant retaining wall interfacing with the public realm. A retaining wall along the south portion of the proposed development is not an appropriate design solution and should be revised in accordance with the recommendations noted above.
- Tree protection is an important element to be considered in integrating this project into its neighbourhood context and establishing a pedestrian connection.
- The Panel has a preference for a taller, slender tower on this site per London Plan policy 293.
- In addition to the comments above, the building design should be refined to address:
 - Scale / context of project in site - including proposed townhouse development to the east
 - Base of building relative to the Thames Valley walkway, podium and response to height (e.g. rhythm of townhouses, and fenestration),
 - Orient additional townhouses to face the park (instead of north),
 - Stone cladding on the bottom of the tower seems poorly proportioned, and “shortens” the building,
 - Placement of windows should be reconsidered to narrow the extent of solid wall in between windows which will increase the visual verticality,
 - Cornices should be explored further for scale, projection, placement, and necessity,
 - the Panel questions the arched windows at the top in context with rest of design,
 - Location of east wall of mechanical penthouse and its glazing,
 - Balconies on east side give a wide appearance– redesign to contribute to the vertical massing
- A pedestrian access from the building to the parkway trail should be provided for residents to access this important community amenity.
- From a site plan submission perspective the following should be addressed:
 - The urban design brief should include the shadow analysis as well as a 3D rendering at street level in context with the existing neighbourhood and proposed townhouse project to visualize its integration with the neighbourhood, particularly from terminating street views.

- Landscape plan is illegible with existing and proposed trees included with proposed site plan. A cohesive landscape design should demonstrate how existing trees are protected and proposed landscape design integrates this important project into its context with the community and adjacent trail system/parkland.
- All plans should be coordinated.

Concluding comments:

The applicant indicated an interest in immediately applying for site plan approval in order to meet a year-end target with the commitment that Panel comments will be addressed through site plan review. Subject to the applicant incorporating the above-noted changes and addressing the comments provided above in a meaningful way, the Panel is supportive of the proposed development.

If the comments provided above are not appropriately addressed through the Site Plan Approval resubmission process, it is recommended that the proposed development be circulated back to the Panel through the formal site plan stage for a second review.

Sincerely on behalf of the UDPRP,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Janine', written in a cursive style.

Janine Oosterveld, MCIP RPP (UDPRP Chair)